

139 East Fourth Street, R. 25 At II P.O. Box 960 Cincinnati, Ohio 45201-0960 Tel: 513-419-1837 Fax: 513-419-1846 dianne.kuhnelll@duke-energy.com

RECEIVED

MAR 09 2009

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Dianne B. Kuhnell. Senior Paralegal

## **VIA HAND DELIVERY**

March 9, 2009

Mr. Jeff Derouen Executive Director Kentucky Public Service Commission 211 Sower Blvd Frankfort, KY 40601

Re: Case No. 2008-00473

Dear Mr. Derouen:

Enclosed please find for filing an original and twelve copies of the Responses to Initial Data Requests from the Commission Staff to Duke Energy Kentucky in the above captioned case.

Please date-stamp the extra two copies of the filing and return to me in the enclosed envelope.

Kuhnel

Sincerely,

Dianne B. Kuhnell Senior Paralegal

cc: Dennis Howard II

## **VERIFICATION**

RECEIVED

MAR 09 2009

State of Ohio	)	SS:	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
County of Hamilton	)		

The undersigned, Richard G. Stevie, being duly sworn, deposes and says that I am employed by the Duke Energy Corporation affiliated companies as Managing Director, Customer Market Analysis; that on behalf of Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc., I have supervised the preparation of the responses to the foregoing responses to information requests; and that the matters set forth in the foregoing response to information requests are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information and belief after reasonable inquire.

Richard G. Stevie, Affiant

Subscribed and sworn to before me by Richard Stevie on this 44 day of March, 2009.

My Commission Expires:

Conita M. Schafer NOTARY PUBLIC

> Notary Public, State of Ohio My Commission Expires November 4, 2009

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

DATA REQUEST	WITNESS	TAB NO.
KyPSC-DR-01-001	Michael Goldenberg	1
KyPSC-DR-01-002	Richard G. Stevie	2
KyPSC-DR-01-003	Michael Goldenberg	3
KyPSC-DR-01-004	Richard G. Stevie	4
KyPSC-DR-01-005	Richard G. Stevie	5

KyPSC-DR-01-001

### **REQUEST:**

Refer to Section B on page 11 of the application. Clarify whether GoodCents Solutions will continue to playa role in Duke Energy's DSM program after the transition to Wisconsin Energy Conservation Corporation and Thermo-Scan Inspections. If yes, how will the three entities work together to support Duke Kentucky's DSM programs?

#### **RESPONSE:**

Good Cents Solutions (dba Good Cents) will continue as the implementation vendor for DE-Kentucky Power Manager Program. Wisconsin Energy Conservation Corporation will be managing the DE-Kentucky Smart Saver Residential and Non-Residential Programs and utilize Thermo-Scan Inspections for the DE-Kentucky Home Energy House Call Program.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Michael Goldenberg

**KyPSC-DR-01-002** 

#### **REQUEST:**

Refer to Appendix I of Duke Kentucky's application, page 1 of 6.

- a. Column 13, "(Over)/Under Collection, Gas" shows a total undercollection of \$2,724,504 for residential programs. Explain how an under-collection of this magnitude occurred. Include all workpapers, spreadsheets, calculations, etc. necessary to support the explanation.
- b. Column 9, "(Over)/Under Collection" for commercial programs references footnote E, which reads "Column 4 + Column 5 + Column 6 + Column 7 Column 8." However, the total over-collection amount for high efficiency programs of (\$925,623) in Column 9 does not comport with footnote E because Column 6 "Shared Savings" is not included in the calculation of that total amount. Clarify whether there is an error in the footnote or the calculation and provide a revised Appendix I as well as revised versions of any other affected appendices.

#### **RESPONSE:**

a. The under-collection pertains to the reconciliation for the period July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008. To more fully understand what happened, we must go back a couple years. In April 2006, the Company was charging approximately \$0.133/MCF to make up for a previous under-collection. (The rider was updated to \$0.133/MCF as a result of an April 2006 order on the previous reconciliation for July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005 for Case No. 2005-00402). Because this rider went into effect so late in the cycle and the previous rider was even larger, the under-collection from the 2004 to 2005 period became a large overcollection of \$1,046,248. As such, this led to a new rider of \$-0.056222/MCF calculated from the reconciliation for the period July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006 (Case No. 2006-00426). However, the credit on the rider was incorrectly applied at a CCF level. It should have been adjusted from a credit per MCF to a credit per CCF. This meant that instead of giving a credit of \$0.056222 per MCF, the credit of \$0.056222 was given per CCF (equivalent to a credit of \$0.56222 per MCF) for a full year. This was not uncovered until the current reconciliation period of July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008 was already completed. The following table details the calculations.

	July 1, 2007 to Ju	ne 3	0, 2008
Line	<u>Category</u>		<u>Gas</u>
	1 Program Expenditures	\$	529,150
	2 2007 Reconciliation	\$	(1,456,207)
	3 Rider Collection	\$	(3,651,561)
(1+2	-3) 2008 Reconciliation	\$	2,724,504 (Note)

(Note) The rider collection would have been (\$365,156) if the credit in the rider had been correctly applied. In that case, the 2008 reconciliation would have been an over-collection of (\$561,901) instead of an under-collection of \$2,724,504.

b. There was an error in the equation in the spreadsheet used to compute the (Over)/Under Collection. A revised version of Appendix I is provided in Attachment KyPSC-DR-01-002.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Richard G. Stevie

(14)

Appendix I Kentucky DSM Rider

Comparison of Revenue Requirement to Rider Recovery

(14)	r Collection Flector (H)	NA	AN	NA		Y S	Z Z	A S	ď Z	04 \$ 49,448		
(13)	(Over)/Under Collection	NA	Y.	AN		¥ :	g Z	Z V	NA V	795,562 \$ 2,724,504		
(12)	Rider Collection (F)	NA	AN AN	NA N		A	A Z	A A	\$ . 795 567			
5	Rider Co	Gas	Š	žž		N A	A S	Z Z	\$	5 (3.651.561		
ć	(10) onciliation	Electric (E)								\$ (100,100,0) \$ (100,000,0) \$ (100,000,000,0) \$	1100,100)	
	(9) (10) 2007 Reconciliation	Gas (D)								1,00	(1,455,201)	
	(8) Chared Savings	Н	39,380	(61,954)		166,632	24,016	5,898			174,104	
		B) 7/	5,049 S	(1,763) \$	n v	· v ·	. 5	4,937 \$			527,149 \$	
	€,	Tost Revenues 107 through 6/08 (	15,049	(1.7			501,222	4			527.	
•			124,113 \$	44,856 \$	17,974	468,225 \$	61,572 \$	4,152 \$	(2,226) \$	•	1,011,648 \$	
Kidel Remove	٣	Program Expenditures (C) Electric	S	40 v v	72 \$	n vo	\$ 68	7.038 S	(3,774) S	,	s 051	
equirement to	(5)	Pro	210,421	76.049	30,472		104,389	104,555	(3.7		529.150	
Comparison of Revenue Requirement to Kidel Newvery	(4)	rogram Expenditure:	707 through 5/06 (5) \$ 334,533.90 \$	86,642.58	48,446.05 \$	144,671.03	165,960.55 \$	166,224.89 \$	(6,000.00)	,	2 640 798 S	
Compariso	,	gs Program E	17 throu	s,	n vi	S	n vi	S 05	2,955 S	<i>s</i>	,	
	{	(1) (2) (3)  This Projected Shared Savings Projected Shared Savings Projected Shared S	7/2007 to 6/2008 (A)	8	35,700		174,000	63,450	2,955			346,040
		res Projected	7/200	6,145 \$	19,810 \$	, v,	., v	690,225 \$	26,781 \$	, s		911,033 \$
		(2) ad Lost Reven	7/2007 to 6/2008 (A)	0 0	49			690	26	171		911
		Duised.	A) 7/200	\$ 000 00	50,000 \$	81,500 \$	875,000 \$	140,000 \$	31,110 \$	53,000 \$	,	2,423,410 \$
		(3)	7/2007 to 6/2008 (A)	499	150	18	875	140	3 15	15.		2,42
			7/20	s u	n vs	s uoi	n vo	so t	n vn	ogram \$	ram (!) \$	s
				Energy Educati	acement	Energy Educat		If Funds	heite	Report Pilot Pr	ince Pilot Prog	xcept for nex
			Residential Programs	Res. Conservation & Energy Education	Refrigerator Replacement	Residential Politic Energy Education	Payment Plus	Program Development Funds	Energy Star Products	Personalized Energy Report Pilot Program	Home Energy Assistance Pilot Program (I)	Revenues collected except for new Total
			Reside	Res. Co	ž :	Reside	Payme	Progra	Energy	Person	Home	Reven

(A) Amounts identified in report filed on November 15, 2007.

(B) Addistip program expenditures, lost eventues, and shared savings for the period July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008 and lost revenues for this period and from prior period DSM measure installations.

(B) Addistip program expenditures, lost eventues, and shared savings for the period 29% gas based upon saturation of gas space healing.

(C) Recovery allowed in accordance with the Commission's Order in Case No. 2004-60038.

(C) Recovery allowed in accordance with the Commission's Order in Case No. 2004-60038.

(C) Recovery allowed in accordance with the Commission's Order in Case No. 2004-60038.

(C) Column (5) + Column (5) + Column (1) - Column (10) - Column (11).

(C) Column (5) + Column (7) + Column (6) + Column (10) - Column (10) + Column

350,453 \$ (237,422) 2,619,408 \$ (184,637) (8) Rider Collection (D) 860,878 \$ 13,287 \$ (7) 2007 Reconciliatio 4,308 \$ 740,986 153 388,727 2,073 151 390,951 441,956 \$ 95,436 \$ 10,698 14,588 25,718 448,830 S 499,834 S 107,641 \$ 308,352 \$ 29,247 \$ 21,031 \$ 298,836 \$ 657,466 \$ 209,520 \$ 142,760 \$ 100,678 \$ 450,814 \$ 903,772 \$ 265,000 \$ Other Total for High Efficiency Program High Efficiency Program Commercial Programs

(A) Amounts identified in report filed on November 15, 2007.

(B) Actual program expenditures, lost revenues, and shared savings for the period July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008 and lost revenues for this period and from prior period DSM measure installations. (C) Receivers allowed in accordance with the Commission's Order in Case No. 2004-00388.

(C) Revenues collected through the DSM Ridder between July 1, 2007 and June 30, 2008.

(E) Column (4) + Column (5) + Column (6) + Column (7) - Column (8)

Appendix I

2009 Projected Program Costs, Lost Revenues, and Shared Savings

Residential Program Summary

Residential - Current Programs/Measures Residential Conservation & Energy Education Refrigerator Replacement Home Energy House Call Residential Comprehensive Freroy Education		Costs 499,800 100,000 150,000 81,500	- A A A A A	Lost Revenues 16,525 6,145 49,810	Sha	1 600	9999	Total 512,826 106,445 235,510 81,500	Allocation of Costs  Electric Gas 37.1% 62.99 100.0% 0.09 37.1% 62.99	of Costs Gas 62.9% 0.0% 62.9% 62.9%	lectri 1		3udget (Costs & Share Electric S 198,452 S 106,445 S 141,160 S 30,237	ared 5 ared 5 52 \$ 45 \$ 5 37 \$	ost Resolution Gas (Gas (	er 52.
Home Energy Assistance Plus (continuing) Power Manager Program Development Funds	64 64 64	150,000 875,000 140,000		1 1 1	\$ 174 \$	174,000	<b>₩</b> ₩ ₩	150,000 ,049,000 140,000	37.1% 100.0% 37.1%	62.9% 0.0% 62.9%	8 8 8 8 73 55	55,650 3 875,000 3 51,940 3	\$ 55,650 \$ 1,049,000 \$ 51,940	00 04 00 04 00 04		94,350 - 88,060
Energy Star Products CFL's (Compact Fluorescent Lights) Torchieres (Floor lamps) Energy Efficiency Web Site Personalized Energy Report Pilot Program Total Costs, Net Lost Revenues, Shared Savings	ө өөө	243,000 31,110 153,000 2,423,410	<b>м</b> ммм	690,225 26,781 121,547 911,033	\$ 63 \$ 73 \$ 346	63,450 2,955 73,134 346,040	<b>м ммм</b>	996,675 60,846 347,681 3,680,483	100.0% 37.1% 37.1%	0.0% 62.9% 62.9%	& & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &	243,000 \$ 11,542 \$ 56,763 \$ 1,665,207	\$ 996,675 \$ 41,278 \$ 251,444 \$ 2,922,280	75 \$ 78 \$ 44 \$ 80 \$		- 19,568 96,237 758,203
Home Energy Assistance Pilot Program	ه ز	\$ 247,369	S.	369 poram Summary								<b>0</b> ,	\$ 143,120	\$ 20		104,249
High Efficiency Program Lighting HVAC Motors Other Total for the High Efficiency Program	<b>өөөө</b>	Costs 104,760 71,380 50,339 225,407 451,885		Lost Revenues 273,388 15,925 10,610 149,418 449,341	Shared Savings \$ 5.34 \$ 12.88 \$ 224,4	nared  North Strain Str	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Total 383,497 94,598 73,808 599,240 1,151,143	Allocations Electric Gi 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	tions Gas 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	E S S S S S S		Budget (Costs, Lost Revenues, & Shared Savings)  Electric \$ 383,497 NA \$ 94,598 NA \$ 73,808 NA \$ 599,240 NA \$ 1,151,143	tt (Costs, Lost Revings) & Shared Savings) soffic Gas 83,497 NA 94,598 NA 73,808 NA 99,240 NA 51,143	Saving Sa	Revenue ngs) Gas NA NA NA NA
High Efficiency School Incentive Program Lighting HVAC Motors Other Total for the High Efficiency School Incentive Program	Oosts See See See	s 104,760 71,380 50,339 225,407 451,885	Lost Reve s s	at, 963 34, 963 13, 323 10, 421 149, 418 208, 125	Shared Savings \$ \$ 12 \$ 224\$	5,349 7,294 2,859 4,415 9,916	Total s s	145,072 91,996 73,619 599,240 909,927	Allocations Electric 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	Gas 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	Electric S & S & S & S & S & S & S & S & S & S		Budget (Costs, Lost Revenues, & Shared Savin Electric Gas \$ 145,072 NA \$ 91,996 NA \$ 73,619 NA \$ 599,240 NA \$ 909,927	Dsts, L G 72 N 72 N 96 N 19 N 40 N	Lost R Gas NA NA NA NA	evenue
PowerShare® Program Total C&I DSM Program	<i></i>	Costs 265,000 1,168,771		Lost Revenues 657,466	က က	hared avings 107,641 607,474		<u>Total</u> 372,641 2,433,710	Allocations Electric 100.0%	Gas 0.0%	⊕ S Elect	ric Costs E 265,000	Budget (Costs, Lost Revenues, & Shared Savin Electric Gas \$ 372,641 NA \$ 2,433,710	3sts, L G 41 N 10	Lost Re Gas NA	ənenne
Total Program	€9	3,592,181	69	1,568,499	\$ 95:	3,514	69	6,114,193								

# Appendix I

Page 3 of 6

Duke Energy Kentucky Demand Side Management Cost Recovery Rider (DSMR) Summary of Calculations for 2006 Programs

January, 2008 through December, 2008

	Progr Costs	
Electric Rider DSM		
Residential Rate RS	\$	2,922,280
Distribution Level Rates Part A DS, DP, DT, GS-FL, EH & SP	\$	2,061,069
Transmission Level Rates & Distribution Level Rates Part B	\$	372,641
Gas Rider DSM Residential Rate RS	\$	758,203

<sup>(</sup>A) See Appendix I, page 2 of 5.

Appendix I Page 4 of 6

Duke Energy Kentucky Demand Side Management Cost Recovery Rider (DSMR) Summary of Billing Determinants

Year 2009

Projected Annual Electric Sales kWH

Rates RS 1,460,230,000

Rates DS, DP, DT,

GS-FL, EH, & SP 2,362,842,000

Rates DS, DP, DT,

GS-FL, EH, SP, & TT 2,559,959,000

Projected Annual Gas Sales CCF

Rate RS 53,671,760

Appendix I

Duke Energy Kentucky Demand Side Management Cost Recovery Rider (DSMR) Summary of Calculations

January, 2009 through December, 2009

Rate Schedule Riders	₹	True-Up Amount (A)	Expected Program Costs (B)		Total DSM Revenue Requirements	Estimated Billing Determinants (C)		DSM Cost Recovery Rider (DSMR)	r (DSMR)	
Electric Rider USM Residential Rate RS	↔	51,411	\$ 2,922,280	₩	2,973,691	1,460,230,000	kWh	↔	0.002036 \$/kWh	\$/kWh
Distribution Level Rates Part A DS, DP, DT, GS-FL, EH & SP	€Đ	(191,967) \$	\$ 2,061,069	₩	1,869,102	2,362,842,000	kWh	<del>69</del>	0.000791 \$/kWh	\$/kWh
Transmission Level Rates & Distribution Level Rates Part B TT	↔	(246,847) \$	\$ 372,641	€9	125,794	2,559,959,000	kWh	↔	0.000049 \$/kWh	\$/kWh
Distribution Level Rates Total DS, DP, DT, GS-FL, EH & SP								<del>ω</del>	0.000840 \$/kWh	\$/kWh
Gas Rider DSM Residential Rate RS	<b>↔</b> ຼ	2,832,667	\$ 758,203	€9	3,590,870	53,671,760	CCF	49	0.066904	\$/CCF
Total Rider Recovery				€9	8,559,456					
Customer Charge for HEA Program <u>Electric No.4</u> Residential Rate RS				٩	Annual Revenues \$ 143,120	Number of Customers 119,267	iers	Monthly Customer Charge \$ 0.10	ner Charge 0.10	
<u>Gas No. 5</u> Residential Rate RS				€>	104,249	86,874		<i></i>	0.10	
Total Customer Charge Revenues				<del>69</del>	247,369					
Total Recovery				↔	8,806,825					
									-	

(A) (Over)/Under of Appendix I page 1 multiplied by 1.0397 for 2008 for the average three-month commercial paper rate to include interest on over or under-recovery.(B) Appendix I, page 2.(C) Appendix I, page 4.

Appendix (	Reconciliation of Lost revenues and Shared Savings Based Upon Impact Evaluation Studies	ost revenues ar	id Shared Sav	rings Based Up	oon Impact Evalua	ation Studies	Page 6 of 6	s of 6
	Case 2006-00426 As Filed & Adjusted Lost Revenues	Shared	New Values Lost Revenues	Shared Savings	Increase (Decrease) in values Lost Shared Revenues Savings	sase) in value Shared Savings	s Comments	
Applicable Programs		,					Souley more elv	
Residential Conservation and Energy Education		٦	٠	U			No new values	
Refrigerator Replacement		143.00	, 6	\$ 4022	\$ (8.457)	\$ (30,904	(30,904) Based upon evaluation	
Residential Home Energy House Call	15,425.00			·	•		No new values	
Power Manager							No new values	
Energy Star Products		,	,	, ,			No new values	
Energy Efficiency Website	\$ 45,936.00 \$	72,530,00	, n (	,			No new values	
Personal Energy Report (PER)			,	, ,, ,			No new values	
C&I High Efficiency Incentive (for Businesses and Schools)			, ,	, ,, ,			No new values	
Lighting	\$ 49,461.00 \$	_	, ,, (				No new values	
HVAC Motors PowetShare	1,221.00	3,4/8	, , , v,	9 V)			No new values	
	000000000000000000000000000000000000000							
	Case 2007-00369		New Values		Increase (Decrease) in values	ease) in value	St	
	Lost	Shared	Lost			Shared	Comments	
Applicable Programs	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Kevelines	200		
	S 701 S	(1.710)	,	S			No new values	
Residential Conservation and Energy Education	2.840			v			Based upon evaluation	
Refrigerator Keplacement	25.180	\$ 39,446	\$ 11,466.63	3 \$ 4,626.07	7 \$ (13,713) \$		(34,820) No new values	
Residential Home Energy House Call		Ψ-	· s	· ·			No new values	
Power Manager	366,355	\$ 134,399	· «	· s			No new values	
Energy Star Products		1,086	s	s			No new values	
Energy Einciency website		,	49	· və			No new values	
Personal Ellergy Nepolit (F.E.N.)			, so	un			No new values	
Col High Efficiency incentive (10) Dusmesses and Consens.	\$ 174,459	\$ 115,659	, s	s,			No new values	
Lighting	2,173	\$ 1,038	s v	, s			No new values	
Motor	136	\$ 95	· s	s			No new values	
PowerShare	69	\$ 5,569	S	\$			No new values	
I net Revenues and Shared Savings for Appendix I Page 1 of 6								
	Reconciliation of 2006 & 2007	2006 & 2007	Case	Case No. 2008-00	T. C.	T		
	Increase (Decrease) in values	se) in values	190	Shared		Shared		
	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	æ	Savings		
			\$ 15,049	e e	8 5 1	\$ 39,588	8	
Residential Conservation and Energy Education			\$ 7,704	və	(77) \$ 7,704	(77)	7)	
Retrigerator Replacement	(22 170)	\$ (65,724)	G	7770	70 \$ (1,763)	s	4)	
Residential Home Energy House Call	(25, 110)			S	s	\$ 166,632	2	
Power Manager	, ,	,	\$ 501.222	S	16 \$ 501,222	\$ 24,016	9	
Energy Star Products	•	, <sub>'</sub>		v	S	\$ 5,898	8	
Energy Efficiency Website	,	,		ı v	US.	G		
Personal Energy Report (PER)	B	·		•		,		
C&I High Efficiency Incentive (for Businesses and Schools)	ú	,	\$ 388.727	7 \$ 740,833	33 \$ 388,727	\$ 740,833	8	
Lighting	, , ,	, ,		S	\$ 2,073	S		
HVAC	,	,		·		\$ 153	9	
Motors	,	, ,		e ce	S	\$ 4,308	82	
PowerShare		•	,					

KyPSC-DR-01-003

## **REQUEST:**

Refer to Appendix I of Duke Kentucky's application, page 1 of 6. Column 4, "Program Expenditures" includes amounts that total \$2,148,273 for all programs from July, 2007 through June, 2008. This amount equals approximately 60 percent of the projected program costs of \$3,592,181 shown in Column 1.

- a. Explain why actual program expenditures were so much less than the projected program costs for the 12 months ended June 2008.
- b. Column 1 on page 2 of 6 of Appendix I shows the projected costs for the 2009 program year. Given that actual expenditures for the prior program year equaled only 60 percent of the budget, explain why the projected costs for the new program year are at the same level, \$3,592,181, as in the prior program year. Identify and describe any changes Duke Kentucky intends to implement to increase actual expenditures.

#### **RESPONSE:**

a. Variance explanations are provided below for each program.

#### 1) Power Manager

• Budget: \$875,000

Expenditures: \$468,224.59Variance: \$406,775.41

Explanation: 1,260 installations were completed which is approximately 50% less than originally projected during the 07/08 timeframe. Installations were slow due to the need to test switches as a result of paging and software issues. As a result, less dollars were spent on switch installations, incentives and marketing. In addition, the cooler weather overall drove paging costs down.

#### 2.) Personal Energy Report (PER)

Budget: \$153,000Expenditures: \$0Variance: \$153,000

Explanation: A PER budget is listed in the 2007/2008 DSM rider appendix; however, PER was only a Summer 2006 pilot. As a result there were no expenditures in fiscal 2007/2008. There was

a ruling in May of 2008 that extended the PER, but no money was spent in May or June of 2008 since the Commission decision came near the end of the spending period.

## 3.) Online Web Kit

• Budget: \$31,110

Expenditures: \$11,190Difference: \$19,920

Explanation: Program participation was less than projected. Research into participation showed that the audit was easy to complete but not as easy to find on the website as anticipated. This has been remedied. Additionally, there were some special promotional campaigns tested specific to this program which did provide increased participation but not on a long term basis.

## 4.) Residential Conservation & Energy Education

Goal	Actual Participation	Budget Am't	Expenditures
250	265	\$500,000	\$334,534

Explanation: Participation goals were met. Average cost per home ended up less than budget

## 5.) Refrigerator Replacement

Goal	Actual Participation	Budget Am't	Expenditures
100	85	\$100,000	\$86,643

Explanation: Participation goals and expenditures are based on actual home owners vs. renters. The mix of these 2 factors determine participation which resulted in the minimal under performance.

## 6.) Payment Plus Program

Goal	Actual Participation	Budget Am't	<u>Expenditures</u>
186	168 Energy Ed	\$150,000	\$144,671

Explanation: Participation goals were a bit under goal due to smaller than normal response rates on direct market mailings, however the drop out rate was lower than past participants.

#### 7.) KY NEED Budget

• Budget: \$81,500

• Expenditures:\$ \$45,781

Explanation: Contract Term is on a Calendar basis Jan-December. Expenses typically reach full budget after the fiscal June cutoff by December of each year. All budgeted funds were spent by December 31, 2008.

#### 8.) Smart Saver Non-residential

• Budget: \$903,770

• Expenditures: \$441,958

• Variance: \$461,812

Explanation: Budget for filing year July 2007 through June 2008 totaled \$309,576. The dollars were available to all eligible non-residential customers including schools. In May of 2008 the Commission ruled on Duke Energy's 2007 filing, increasing the budget to \$903,770. Half of that budget (\$451,885) was allocated to a new "schools" program. The approval timing did not correspond with how schools plan for projects of this type. They typically seek approval for

projects and go out for bid in the fall preceding the summer when the work will actually take place. It wasn't until the summer of 2008, that schools were able to take advantage of these incentives. The other \$451,885, allocated to the business customers was spent. Additionally, labor charges were split across three jurisdictions saving 2/3 on those budget dollars and because of the growing participation in the program, very little monies were spent on marketing.

### 9.) Home Energy HouseCall

• Budget: \$150,000

• Expenditures: \$120,904

• Variance: \$29,096

Explanation: Exceeded participation goal of 500 by 68 audits. The Company was able to exceed the goal without marketing costs due to pent up demand. Additionally, labor costs were shared across three jurisdictions.

b.

As explained in the response to a above lower marketing costs and timing were the primary drivers for expenditures being under budget with the exception of Power Manager where switch issues are still being rectified. It is anticipated that in 2009, budgeted dollars for marketing will be needed to meet projected goals. Additionally, timing issues will no longer come be an issue in the C&I Schools program so it is anticipated that those dollars will also be expended.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Michael Goldenberg

KyPSC-DR-01-004

# **REQUEST:**

Refer to Appendix I of Duke Kentucky's application, page 6 of 6. Footnote A references Appendix J, page 1; however, there is no Appendix J in the application. Provide the referenced appendix or other revision needed to rectify this inconsistency.

#### **RESPONSE:**

The reference to Appendix J should have been Appendix I. This is corrected in the Revised Appendix I provided as Attachment KyPSC-DR-01-002b.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Richard G. Stevie

,		

**KyPSC-DR-01-005** 

## **REQUEST:**

Refer to Appendix I of Duke Kentucky's application, page 6 of 6. The heading for the section at the bottom one-third of the page refers to Appendix K, page 1 of 6; however, there is no Appendix K in the application. Provide the referenced appendix or other revision needed to rectify this inconsistency.

#### **RESPONSE:**

The reference to Appendix K should have been to Appendix I. This is corrected in the Revised Appendix I provided as Attachment KyPSC-DR-01-002b.

PERSON RESPONSIBLE: Richard G. Stevie